

REMARKS

The Examiner requires restriction to one of the following inventions:

Species A: corresponding to claims 19, 20, and 23;

Species B: corresponding to claim 22;

Species C: corresponding to claim 24;

Species D: corresponding to claims 25 and 26;

Species E: corresponding to claim 27; and

Species F: corresponding to claim 28.

While Applicants do not agree with the merits of this restriction requirement for the reasons explained below, *Applicants elect **with traverse** Species A, which corresponds to claims 19, 20, and 23.*

Applicants traverse the requirement of restriction for the following reasons.

Unity of Invention

The present application is a national stage entry application of an International Patent Application, under 35 U.S.C. § 371. As stated in M.P.E.P. § 1896, restriction practice for such an application differs from one filed under 35 U.S.C. § 111, in that the former is subject to unity of invention practice under 37 C.F.R. § 1.499 while the latter is subject to U.S. restriction practice under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.141 - 1.146. **Thus, the present application is not subject to U.S. restriction practice, but rather to unity of invention practice.**

Under a proper analysis, performed under unity of invention practice, the Office Action fails to establish that the claims are not “so linked as to form a single general inventive concept.” PCT Rule 13.1.

In this regard, the Office Action **fails to establish lack of unity of invention** since the Office Action has not identified any prior art considered with respect to any of the claims, has not indicated which features of the claims distinguish the claims over the prior art, and has not indicated whether a determination has been made that the claims of Species A-F do not share **any** special technical feature that distinguishes the claims over the prior art.

In this regard, it is noted that unlike U.S. restriction practice, whether each of different claims includes technical features that the others of the claims do not have is **irrelevant** in a lack of unity analysis, except to the extent it is determined that the different

claims do not share any of the same technical features. In order to make this determination with respect to two claims ‘A’ and ‘B,’ it must be determined that none of the features which distinguish claim ‘A’ over the prior art are included in claim ‘B’ and also that none of the features which distinguish claim ‘B’ over the prior art are included in claim ‘A.’

“A group of inventions is considered linked to form a single general inventive concept where there is a technical relationship among the inventions that involves at least one common or corresponding special technical feature.” M.P.E.P. § 1893.03(d) (emphasis added). That is, as long as at least one common special technical feature is shared among all of the claims, the claims must be considered as being directed to a single general inventive concept.

Therefore, a determination of lack of unity cannot be made without first considering the relevant prior art, except where there is no subject matter which is common to all of the claims. Where there is any subject matter which is common to all of the claims, **unity of invention is necessarily present**, unless it is determined that the common subject matter does not distinguish the claims over the prior art. As explained in M.P.E.P. § 1850(II), only the case of “independent claims to A + X, A + Y, X + Y can be said to lack unity *a priori* [*i.e.*, prior to considering the prior art,] as there is no subject matter common to all of the claims [since A is lacking in claim 3, X is lacking in claim 2, and Y is lacking in claim 1. However, in] the case of independent claims to A + X and A + Y, unity of invention is present *a priori* as A is common to both claims.” (Emphasis added.)

Moreover, “[u]nity of invention has to be considered in the first place only in relation to the independent claims . . . and not the dependent claims. . . . If the independent claims avoid the prior art . . . , no problem of lack of unity arises in respect of any claims that depend on the independent claims. In particular, it does not matter if a dependent claim itself contains a further invention.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

Application of the Rules to the Present Claims

In the present application, all of claims 19 to 35 depend from a single independent claim 18 so that unity of invention is therefore necessarily present *a priori*, i.e., prior to consideration of any of the relevant prior art. Specifically all of claims 18 to 35 share at least the technical features of independent claim 18, so that all of the claims share at least one “same or corresponding special technical feature.” The Office Action has not identified any prior art that has been considered with respect to the claims. Specifically, the Office Action has not identified any prior art that renders the independent claim 18 not novel and obvious.

Unity of invention is therefore necessarily present between all of claims 18 to 35, since whichever feature might distinguish independent claim 18 over the prior art is present in all of the presently pending claims. Since that feature is present in each of claims 18 to 35, therefore all of claims 18 to 35 are so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. Therefore, with election of claim 18, no restriction between the dependent claims 19 to 35 can be made based on a lack of unity of invention.

That is, at least one common technical feature is shared by all of the present claims, since all of the technical features of claim 18 are included in all of its dependent claims. Therefore, that Species A-F might differ in that they may include different additional features that pertain to different ones of the described embodiments is irrelevant. Therefore, no restriction of species can be made between any of claims 18 to 35.

The Office Action therefore fails to establish lack of unity of invention.

Applicants respectfully request an early and favorable action on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: July 30, 2009
By: Aaron Grunberger (Reg. No. 59,210) for:
Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

Customer No. 26646